

March 8, 1967

H2347

results of the poll in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington]

# MEMBERSHIP OPINION POLL ON UNIFORM MONDAY HOLIDAYS AS OF OCT. 14, 1966 (FINAL RESULTS)

1. Do you approve the general idea of uniform Monday holidays?

	Percent
Yes (8,210)-----	85
No (1,356)-----	14
No opinion (98)-----	1
Total (9,664)-----	100

2. Do you believe your employees would like the idea?

	Percent
Yes (8,447)-----	90
No (483)-----	5
No opinion (497)-----	5
Total (9,427)-----	100

3. Indicate which of the following holidays you'd like to see changed. If you wish, signify your preference for a new day for any of the holidays.

Washington's Birthday, Feb. 22 (62 percent)----- 5,962

To 3d Monday in February----- 5,718  
Some other day----- 244

Memorial Day, May 30 (74 percent)----- 7,104

To last Monday in May----- 6,968  
Some other day----- 136

Independence Day, July 4 (72 percent)----- 6,935

To 1st Monday in July----- 6,687  
Some other day----- 248

Veterans Day Nov. 11 (66 percent)----- 6,423

To 2d Monday in November----- 2,213  
To 1st Monday in November----- 1,041

To 1st Monday in April (because November already has Thanksgiving, and March-April period has no designated holiday)----- 2,857  
Some other day----- 312

Thanksgiving, 4th Thursday in November (73 percent)----- 7,049

To 4th Monday in November----- 3,783  
To 3rd Monday in November----- 2,761

Some other day----- 505

4. How would a change to uniform Monday holidays affect your business?

Production, work schedules:

Helpful----- 1,154  
Harmful----- 675

No change----- 2,404  
No opinion----- 162

Total----- 9,295

Payroll, other costs:

Helpful----- 3,203  
Harmful----- 472

No change----- 5,019  
No opinion----- 267

Total----- 8,961

Sales of goods and services:

Helpful----- 3,096  
Harmful----- 536

No change----- 4,818  
No opinion----- 502

Total----- 8,952

5. Indicate your firm's major activity.

Manufacturing-----	3,537
Finance, insurance, and real estate-----	1,737
Wholesale and retail trade-----	1,597
Services-----	955
Construction-----	785
Other-----	418
Transportation-----	303
Communications and utilities-----	223
Mining-----	101
Total-----	9,656

6. Approximately how many regular employees do you have?

1 to 3 employees-----	102
4 to 9-----	466
10 to 25-----	1,566
26 to 99-----	3,351
100 to 250-----	1,942
250 to 500-----	884
Over 500-----	1,332
Total-----	9,643

In January of this year This Week, the national Sunday supplement magazine, conducted a poll on this question and, on the basis of a reported 200,000 returns, found 90 percent favoring a uniform observance holiday plan.

During the last Congress we moved to establish time uniformity in this Nation through legislation designed to eliminate the annual time scramble resulting from the switch on and off daylight saving time. We should now consider similar action regarding our holidays.

Therefore, I am pleased today to offer legislation which would provide for a uniform observance of four holidays which now fall at random throughout the week.

They are Washington's Birthday which would be observed on the third Monday in February, Memorial Day on the last Monday in May, Independence Day on the first Monday in July and Veterans' Day on the second Monday in November.

This idea has been before the Congress in one form or another for many years and should now be given consideration.

## STATEMENT BY 12 FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. KORNAGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether other Members have presented this view of the CIA dispute but I believe it to be important enough for the RECORD of Congress.

## STATEMENT BY 12 FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

AKRON, OHIO,  
February 27, 1967.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the statement made by twelve former presidents of the National Student Association regarding recent press reports on the relationship between NSA and the Central Intelligence Agency.

This statement was released to the press on February 25, 1967.

W. DENNIS SHAUL.

"FEBRUARY 25, 1967.

"As former presidents of the National Student Association we feel that a responsible and thoughtful explanation of the relationship of the NSA to the CIA is desirable. Each of us speaks for the year he served as president.

"The international world of the 1950's and early 1960's was largely a bipolar world and that fact was important in shaping NSA's decisions. NSA recognized the vital importance of American student participation in international student affairs which otherwise would have been dominated by the well trained and well informed representatives of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. But our's was no reflex Cold War action. Indeed it was precisely out of NSA's dissent from many aspects of American post war foreign policy which often seemed to us intransigent and inflexible that many of the Association's international programs were born.

"NSA believed that there was a critical need for the American student movement to be an active participant in world affairs in order to create a more sensible international atmosphere. Students were one important voice among many American voices abroad in a complex world which required that many American viewpoints in addition to the governmental viewpoint be heard.

"Three aspects of NSA's international policies should be emphasized:

"NSA consistently supported and sought to strengthen democratic student organizations in those countries where they existed and encouraged their formation where they did not exist. The political and social importance of students and student organizations was not then widely recognized, but it was evident to us that students were a significant and influential elite in their countries.

"NSA's international policy early recognized the crucial importance which nationalist movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America would have in shaping our world. NSA's attitude was consistently but not uncritically sympathetic to nationalist aspirations. Others were equally aware of those aspirations, but at that time much U.S. foreign policy was still focused upon Europe and the Soviet Union. There were few institutions through which individuals who felt the urgency of American cooperation with nationalist groups could act. NSA was one such institution.

"While we were quite aware of the expansionist ambitions and ideological goals of the Soviet Union, NSA chose to deal with the Soviets and Eastern Europeans not as ideological pariahs but as political adversaries in a changing world. We felt that the politics of confrontation would not only hinder Soviet domination of international student life, but would also enable young Soviets and Eastern Europeans to come into contact with the ideas and convictions of young Americans, and vice versa.

"Without substantial funds, NSA's international program would have been immobilized. Yet each of us concluded that, without question, we would have chosen immobilization if the only funds available were conditioned on impairment of the independence of any of NSA's principles or programs.

"And so the question became whether CIA funds entailed any such conditions. We state categorically that they did not. Each of us after being elected to office was fully informed about the CIA relationship. Allegations that we were "trapped" or "duped" are arrant nonsense. While we constantly searched for alternative sources of funds, this relationship was the only realistic and responsible alternative available to us at that time. Each of us authorized its continuation subject to the controls and safeguards which we each deemed necessary to

ensure the complete independence and integrity of NSA. One such safeguard was to insist that senior elected officers in succeeding years be informed of the relationship so that no possibility could exist of by-passing the duly elected leadership of the Association, which could reappraise the relationship annually. Each of us maintained the utmost vigilance and independence of judgment during his term of office. Attempts at control would not have been tolerated. Any such attempts would have resulted in an immediate termination of the relationship.

"The absence of controls should be absolutely clear to anyone who is either familiar with NSA or willing to take the time to review the record. Each NSA policy and program was adopted by the governing bodies of the Association, the National Student Congresses. For nearly twenty years NSA has remained constant to the principles it established in the late 1940's long before any financial discussion with the government took place. These policies and programs have been consistently independent of and often in conflict with the positions of the government. NSA friends and foes alike have verified this fact throughout NSA's history.

"Political contexts change. The national and international situation in which NSA creates its present policies is no longer the one in which we made our decisions. We have always recognized the responsibility of each group of current leaders of NSA to lead the organization in the direction which seems to them appropriate during their term of office, subject to the decisions of the governing bodies of the Association.

"In retrospect we feel that in the world in which we worked the relationship helped make it possible for the American student movement to make important contributions toward the development of democratic student organizations. We reaffirm our sense of pride in the free and independent accomplishment of NSA during those years. We reaffirm our conviction that all those individuals who shared in carrying out NSA's international activities did so with honor in the best traditions of American voluntary service.

"William T. Dentzer, Jr., 1952; James M. Edwards, 1954; Harry H. Lunn, Jr., 1955; Stanford L. Glass, 1956; Harald O. Bakken, 1957; K. Ray Farabee, 1958; Robert R. Kiley, 1959; Donald A. Hoffman, 1960; Richard A. Rettig, 1961; Edward R. Garvey, 1962; W. Dennis Shaul, 1963; Gregory M. Gallo, 1964."

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which I feel is essential to the orderly development of one of our greatest, and most coveted, natural resources, the mighty Colorado River. Similar bills have been offered by the senior Senator and at least eight other Members from my own State of California.

With my colleagues, I am concerned about the possible consequences if we abandon the regional approach, incorporated so successfully last year in H.R. 4671, in favor of shortsighted sectionalism.

Our legislation would not only authorize the central Arizona project, a laudable and long-overdue endeavor to furnish that State a fair share of Colorado River water; it also would protect the just interests of the six other States that share the Colorado River basin.

California would be guaranteed 4.4 million acre-feet of water from the river each year. It would be difficult for California to live with a bill that did not carry such assurance, for my State already is using some 5 million acre-feet. At the same time, California's rapid population growth is creating an inexorable demand for an additional 200,000 acre-feet every 12 months.

Like H.R. 4671, the legislation we are recommending would direct the Secretary of the Interior to make a reconnaissance report on potential new sources of water for replenishing the Colorado and, if that were favorable, a followup feasibility study.

Again, the need for such a feature in the legislation seems self-evident to me. The Colorado today simply does not have enough water to meet the existing and future demands upon it. Within 25 years, we are told, the annual deficit will be about 4.5 million acre-feet, unless we can somehow locate and import enough water from other sources to sustain the Colorado. The projected deficit, incidentally, is greater than the entire entitlement proposed by my bill for California.

I am strongly supporting the construction of the single dam at Bridge Canyon which would be authorized by our bill. The Hualapai Dam, as it is known, would eventually produce revenues, through the sale of electric power, of more than \$400 million—a necessary economic base for the central Arizona project and also for future importation proposals.

It is my belief that the single dam represents a sound compromise between the two dams that were originally proposed and the prohibition against any dam at all that is sought by some conservationist groups. While I respect and applaud the view that the Grand Canyon should be maintained, to the maximum extent possible, in its original, pristine state, I cannot subscribe to the fears that the one dam would create any significant flooding of the canyon.

Our bill has the drawback of any compromise: not everyone is going to be wildly enthusiastic about it. But in balance, it is a forward looking and equitable proposal, recognizing, as it does, that our critical western water shortage

is a problem that no individual State, acting alone, can solve—even within its own boundaries. The Colorado is a shared resource, and we must unite in a regional effort to make its precious water last forever.

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. VAN DEERLIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### CAPITOL FLAG FLYING OVER MEKONG DELTA

(Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have served in the House for over 14 years, and if I served for 40 years I could find few sights more thrilling each morning than the spectacle of the Nation's flag flying over the majestic building in which this House has its home. But today I received in my mail a photograph which was even more moving than that sight. I wish the rules permitted the inclusion of photographs in the RECORD. The photo to which I refer was sent to me by Sp4c. Regis Gavalik of "C" Company, 60th Infantry Regiment, 9th Infantry Division, and it is a picture of an American flag, which has previously flown over the Capitol, flying over "C" Company's command post in the Mekong Delta. There is something deeply moving about the sight of that flag which once flew over this House as we debated how to govern free men and which now flies over the outposts of freedom halfway around the globe.

A flag is a tiny contribution, indeed, when compared with the blood and sweat and suffering the men of "C" Company are giving in the cause which that flag symbolizes. Mr. Speaker, the men of "C" Company have honored the Congress deeply by showing our flag in the front lines of freedom. I ask unanimous consent that some of Specialist Gavalik's letters be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

FEBRUARY 10, 1967.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to hear that you will obtain a flag for me. The reason for the flag is; some of the men and myself would like to raise it everytime we move to the line or I should say the berm.

The berm is the places or I should say bunkers that are around the Fort. I am at now. The berm is just to protect and make sure nobody that isn't suppose to come in the Fort comes in.

The flag is just to show the Viet Cong that we are here and we are going to stay as long as Uncle Sam needs for us to stay here in the Mekong Delta.

Sir we thank you for when you will send the flag. All the men here will appreciate the flag. Because we all know this flag represents the United States, that we are fighting for over here.

Thank you,

Pfc. REGIS GAVALIK.